G_2-GRASSMANNIANS AND DERIVED EQUIVALENCES

KAZUSHI UEDA

arXiv:1612.08443v2 [math.AG] 15 Jan 2017

Abstract. We prove the derived equivalence of a pair of non-compact Calabi–Yau 7-folds, which are the total spaces of certain rank 2 bundles on G_2-Grassmannians. The proof follows that of the derived equivalence of Calabi–Yau 3-folds in G_2-Grassmannians by Kuznetsov [Kuz] closely.

1. Introduction

The simply-connected simple algebraic group G of type G_2 has three homogeneous spaces $\mathbf{G} := G/P_1$, $\mathbf{Q} := G/P_2$, and $\mathbf{F} := G/B$ associated with the crossed Dynkin diagrams , , and  respectively. The Picard group of $\mathbf{F}$ can be identified with the weight lattice of G, which in turn can be identified with $\mathbb{Z}^2$ as $(a,b) := a\omega_1 + b\omega_2$, where ω_1 and ω_2 are the fundamental weights associated with the long root and the short root respectively. We write the line bundle associated with the weight (k,l) as $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(k,l)$.

Let

$$R := \bigoplus_{k,l=0}^{\infty} H^0\left(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(k,l)\right) \cong \bigoplus_{k,l=0}^{\infty} \left(V^G_{(k,l)}\right)^\vee \tag{1.1}$$

be the Cox ring of $\mathbf{F}$, where $\left(V^G_{(k,l)}\right)^\vee$ is the dual of the irreducible representation of G with the highest weight (k,l).

The $\mathbb{Z}^2$-grading of R defines a $(\mathbb{G}_m)^2$-action on $\operatorname{Spec} R$, which induces an action of $\mathbb{G}_m$ embedded in $(\mathbb{G}_m)^2$ by the anti-diagonal map $\alpha \mapsto (\alpha, \alpha^{-1})$. We write the geometric invariant theory quotients as

$$\mathbf{V}_+ := \operatorname{Proj} R_+, \quad \mathbf{V}_- := \operatorname{Proj} R_-, \quad \mathbf{V}_0 := \operatorname{Spec} R_0, \tag{1.2}$$

where

$$R_n = \bigoplus_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} R_{i,n-i}, \quad R_+ := \bigoplus_{n=0}^{\infty} R_n, \quad R_- := \bigoplus_{n=0}^{\infty} R_{-n}. \tag{1.3}$$

$\mathbf{V}_+$ and $\mathbf{V}_-$ are the total spaces of the dual of the equivariant vector bundles of rank 2 on $\mathbf{Q}$ and $\mathbf{G}$ associated with irreducible representations of P_1 and P_2 with the highest weight $(1,1)$. The structure morphisms $\phi_+ \colon \mathbf{V}_+ \to \mathbf{V}_0$ and $\phi_- \colon \mathbf{V}_- \to \mathbf{V}_0$ are crepant resolutions which contract the zero-sections.

The same construction for the simply-connected simple algebraic group $\mathrm{Sp}(2)$ of type C_2, which is accidentally isomorphic to the simply-connected simple algebraic group $\mathrm{Spin}(5)$ of type B_2, gives the 5-fold flop discussed in [Seg16], where it is attributed to Abuaf.

The main result in this paper is the following:

Theorem 1.1. *$\mathbf{V}_+$ and $\mathbf{V}_-$ are derived-equivalent.*

Theorem 1.1 provides an evidence for the conjecture [BO02, Conjecture 4.4] [Kaw02, Conjecture 1.2] that birationally equivalent smooth projective varieties are K-equivalent if and only if they are D-equivalent.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 closely follows [Kuz], where the derived equivalence of Calabi–Yau complete intersections in $\mathbf{G}$ and $\mathbf{Q}$ defined by sections of the equivariant vector bundles dual to $\mathbf{V}_+$ and $\mathbf{V}_-$. The derived equivalence of these Calabi–Yau 3-folds in turn follows from Theorem 1.1 using matrix factorizations.

Notations and conventions. We work over a field $\mathbf{k}$ throughout this paper. All pull-back and push-forward are derived. The complexes underlying $\mathrm{Ext}^\bullet(-,-)$ and $H^\bullet(-)$ will be denoted by $\mathbf{hom}(-,-)$ and $\mathbf{h}(-)$.

Acknowledgements. We thank Atsushi Ito, Makoto Miura, and Shinnosuke Okawa for collaborations [IMOUa, IMOUb, IMOUc] which led to this work. K.U. is supported by Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research (24740043, 15KT0105, 16K13743, 16H03930).

2. The blow-up diagram

The G_2-Grassmannian $\mathbf{G}$ is the zero locus $s_\lambda^{-1}(0)$ of the section s_λ of the equivariant vector bundle $\mathcal{Q}^\vee(1)$ of rank 5 on $\mathrm{Gr}(2,V)$, obtained as the tensor product of the dual $\mathcal{Q}^\vee$ of the universal quotient bundle $\mathcal{Q}$ and the hyperplane bundle $\mathcal{O}(1)$. Here $V \coloneqq V^G_{(0,1)}$ is the 7-dimensional fundamental representation of G_2, and s_λ corresponds to the G_2-invariant 3-form on V under the isomorphism $H^0(\mathrm{Gr}(2,V),\mathcal{Q}^\vee(1)) \cong \bigwedge^3 V^\vee$. We write the G_2-equivariant vector bundle associated with the irreducible representation of P_1 with the highest weight (a,b) as $\mathcal{E}_{(a,b)}$. The restriction $\mathscr{U} \coloneqq \mathcal{S}|_{\mathbf{G}}$ of the universal subbundle $\mathcal{S}$ of rank 2 on $\mathrm{Gr}(2,V)$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{E}_{(-1,1)}$.

The G_2-flag variety $\mathbf{F}$ is isomorphic to the total space of the $\mathbb{P}^1$-bundle $\varpi_+ \colon \mathbb{P}(\mathscr{U}) \to \mathbf{G}$ associated with $\mathscr{U}$ (or any other equivariant vector bundle of rank 2, since all of them are related by a twist by a line bundle). We write the relative hyperplane class of ϖ_+ as h, so that

$$(\varpi_+)_*\left(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(h)\right) \cong \mathscr{U}^\vee. \tag{2.1}$$

The pull-back to $\mathbf{F}$ of the hyperplane class H in $\mathbf{G}$ will be denoted by H again by abuse of notation.

The other G_2-Grassmannian $\mathbf{Q}$ is a quadric hypersurface in $\mathbb{P}(V)$. We write the equivariant vector bundle on $\mathbf{Q}$ associated with the irreducible representation of P_2 with highest weight (a,b) as $\mathcal{F}_{(a,b)}$. The flag variety $\mathbf{F}$ has a structure of a $\mathbb{P}^1$-bundle $\varpi_- \colon \mathbf{F} \to \mathbf{Q}$, whose relative hyperplane class is given by H. We define a vector bundle $\mathscr{K}$ on $\mathbf{Q}$ by

$$\mathscr{K} \coloneqq \left((\varpi_-)_*\left(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(H)\right)\right)^\vee, \tag{2.2}$$

so that $\mathbf{F} \cong \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{G}}(\mathscr{K})$. One can show that $\mathscr{K}$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{F}_{(1,-3)}$. We write the hyperplane class of $\mathbf{Q}$ as h by abuse of notation, since it pulls back to h on $\mathbf{F}$.

Let $\mathbf{V}$ be the total space of the line bundle $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(-h-H)$ on $\mathbf{F}$. The structure morphism will be denoted by $\pi \colon \mathbf{V} \to \mathbf{F}$. The Cox ring of $\mathbf{V}$ is the $\mathbb{N}^2$-graded ring

$$S = \bigoplus_{k,l=0}^{\infty} S_{k,l} \tag{2.3}$$

given by

$$S_{k,l} \coloneqq H^0\left(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{V}}(k,l)\right) \tag{2.4}$$

$$\cong H^0\left(\pi_*\left(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{V}}(k,l)\right)\right) \tag{2.5}$$

$$\cong H^0\left(\pi_*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{V}} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(k,l)\right) \tag{2.6}$$

$$\cong H^0\left(\left(\bigoplus_{m=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(m,m)\right) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(k,l)\right) \tag{2.7}$$

$$\cong \bigoplus_{m=0}^{\infty} H^0\left(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(k+m,l+m)\right) \tag{2.8}$$

$$\cong \bigoplus_{m=0}^{\infty} \left(V^G_{(k+m,l+m)}\right)^{\vee}, \tag{2.9}$$

whose multiple Proj recovers $\mathbf{V}$. Similarly, the Cox ring of the total space $\mathbf{W}_+$ of the bundle $\mathcal{E}^{\vee}_{(1,1)} \cong \mathscr{U}(-H)$ is given by $\bigoplus_{k=0}^{\infty} H^0\left(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{W}_+}(kH)\right)$ where

$$H^0\left(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{W}_+}(kH)\right) \cong H^0\left(\pi_*\left(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{W}_+}(kH)\right)\right) \tag{2.10}$$

$$\cong H^0\left(\pi_*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{W}_+} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{G}}(kH)\right) \tag{2.11}$$

$$\cong \bigoplus_{m=0}^{\infty} H^0\left(\left(\operatorname{Sym}^m \mathcal{E}_{(1,1)}\right) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{G}}(kH)\right) \tag{2.12}$$

$$\cong \bigoplus_{m=0}^{\infty} H^0\left(\mathcal{E}_{(m,m)} \otimes \mathcal{E}_{(k,0)}\right) \tag{2.13}$$

$$\cong \bigoplus_{m=0}^{\infty} H^0\left(\mathcal{E}_{(m+k,m)}\right). \tag{2.14}$$

This is isomorphic to R_+, so that $\mathbf{W}_+$ is isomorphic to $\mathbf{V}_+$, and the affinization morphism

$$\mathbf{V} \to \operatorname{Spec} H^0\left(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{V}}\right) \cong \mathbf{V}_0 \tag{2.15}$$

is the composition of the natural projection $\varphi_+ \colon \mathbf{V} \to \mathbf{V}_+$ and the affinization morphism $\phi_+ \colon \mathbf{V}_+ \to \mathbf{V}_0$. Since $\mathbf{V}_+$ is the total space of $\mathcal{E}^{\vee}_{(1,1)}$, the ideal sheaf of the zero-section is the image of the natural morphism from $\pi_+^*\mathcal{E}_{(1,1)}$ to $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{V}_+}$, and the morphism φ_+ is the blow-up along it. Similarly, the affinization morphism (2.15) also factors into the blow-up $\varphi_- \colon \mathbf{V} \to \mathbf{V}_-$ and the affinization morphism $\phi_- \colon \mathbf{V}_- \to \mathbf{V}_0$, and one obtains the following commutative diagram:

(2.16)



3. Some extension groups

The zero-sections and the natural projections fit into the following diagram:

(3.1)



We write $\mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}} \coloneqq \varpi_+^*\mathscr{U}$, $\mathscr{S}_{\mathbf{F}} \coloneqq \varpi_-^*\mathscr{S}$, and $\mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{V}} \coloneqq \pi^*\mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}}$. By abuse of notation, we use the same symbol for an object of $D^b(\mathbf{F})$ and its image in $D^b(\mathbf{V})$ by the push-forward ι_*. Since $\mathbf{V}$ is the total space of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{V}}(-h-H)$, one has a locally free resolution

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{V}}(h+H) \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{V}} \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}} \to 0 \tag{3.2}$$

of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}$ as an $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{V}}$-module.

By tensoring $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(-h)$ to [Kuz, Equation (5)], one obtains an exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(H-2h) \to \mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}}^\vee(-h) \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}} \to 0. \tag{3.3}$$

Lemma 3.1 and Proposition 3.2 below are taken from [Kuz]:

Lemma 3.1 ([Kuz, Lemma 1])**.** *(i) Line bundles $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(th-H)$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(tH-h)$ are acyclic for all $t \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

(ii) Line bundles $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(-2H)$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(2h-2H)$ are acyclic and

$$H^\bullet(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(3h-2H)) \cong \mathbf{k}[-1].$$

(iii) Vector bundles $\mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}}(-2H)$, $\mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}}(-H)$, $\mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}}(h-H)$ and $\mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}} \otimes \mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}}(-H)$ are acyclic, and

$$H^\bullet(\mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}}(h)) \cong \mathbf{k}, \quad H^\bullet(\mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}} \otimes \mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}}(h)) \cong \mathbf{k}[-1].$$

Proposition 3.2 ([Kuz, Proposition 3 and Lemma 4])**.** *One has an exact sequence*

$$0 \to \mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}} \to \mathscr{S}_{\mathbf{F}} \to \mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}}^\vee(-h) \to 0. \tag{3.4}$$

Lemma 3.1 immediately implies the following:

Lemma 3.3. *$\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(-H)$ is right orthogonal to both $\mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}}^\vee(-h)$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(-h)$.*

Proof. We have

$$\mathbf{hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{V}}}\left(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(-h), \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(-H)\right) \cong \mathbf{hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{V}}}\left(\left\{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{V}}(H) \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{V}}(-h)\right\}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(-H)\right) \tag{3.5}$$

$$\cong \mathbf{h}\left(\left\{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(h-H) \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(-2H)\right\}\right) \tag{3.6}$$

and

$$\mathbf{hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{V}}}\left(\mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}}^\vee(-h), \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(-H)\right) \cong \mathbf{hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{V}}}\left(\left\{\mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{V}}^\vee(H) \to \mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{V}}^\vee(-h)\right\}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(-H)\right) \tag{3.7}$$

$$\cong \mathbf{h}\left(\left\{\mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}}(h-H) \to \mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}}(-2H)\right\}\right), \tag{3.8}$$

both of which vanish by Lemma 3.1. □

Lemma 3.4. *One has*

$$\mathbf{hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{V}}}\left(\mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}}^\vee(-h), \mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}}\right) \cong \mathbf{k}[-1]. \tag{3.9}$$

Proof. One has

$$\mathbf{hom}_{\mathcal{O}_\mathbf{V}}\left(\mathscr{U}_\mathbf{F}^\vee(-h), \mathscr{U}_\mathbf{F}\right) \cong \mathbf{hom}_{\mathcal{O}_\mathbf{V}}\left(\left\{\mathscr{U}_\mathbf{V}^\vee(H) \to \mathscr{U}_\mathbf{V}^\vee(-h)\right\}, \mathscr{U}_\mathbf{F}\right) \tag{3.10}$$

$$\cong \mathbf{h}\left(\left\{\mathscr{U}_\mathbf{F} \otimes \mathscr{U}_\mathbf{F}(h) \to \mathscr{U}_\mathbf{F} \otimes \mathscr{U}_\mathbf{F}(-H)\right\}\right). \tag{3.11}$$

Lemma 3.1 shows that the first term gives $\mathbf{k}[-1]$ and the second term vanishes. □

Lemma 3.5. *One has*

$$\mathbf{hom}_{\mathcal{O}_\mathbf{V}}\left(\mathscr{U}_\mathbf{F}^\vee(-h), \mathcal{O}_\mathbf{F}\right) \cong \mathbf{k}. \tag{3.12}$$

Proof. One has

$$\mathbf{hom}_{\mathcal{O}_\mathbf{V}}\left(\mathscr{U}_\mathbf{F}^\vee(-h), \mathcal{O}_\mathbf{F}\right) \cong \mathbf{hom}_{\mathcal{O}_\mathbf{V}}\left(\left\{\mathscr{U}_\mathbf{V}^\vee(H) \to \mathscr{U}_\mathbf{V}^\vee(-h)\right\}, \mathcal{O}_\mathbf{F}\right) \tag{3.13}$$

$$\cong \mathbf{h}\left(\left\{\mathscr{U}_\mathbf{F}(h) \to \mathscr{U}_\mathbf{F}(-H)\right\}\right). \tag{3.14}$$

Lemma 3.1 shows that the first term gives $\mathbf{k}$ and the second term vanishes. □

Lemma 3.6. *One has*

$$\mathbf{hom}_{\mathcal{O}_\mathbf{V}}\left(\mathcal{O}_\mathbf{F}(H-2h), \mathcal{O}_\mathbf{F}(h)\right) \cong 0. \tag{3.15}$$

Proof. One has

$$\mathbf{hom}_{\mathcal{O}_\mathbf{V}}\left(\mathcal{O}_\mathbf{F}(H-2h), \mathcal{O}_\mathbf{F}(h)\right) \cong \mathbf{hom}_{\mathcal{O}_\mathbf{V}}\left(\left\{\mathcal{O}_\mathbf{V}(2H-h) \to \mathcal{O}_\mathbf{V}(H-2h)\right\}, \mathcal{O}_\mathbf{F}(h)\right) \tag{3.16}$$

$$\cong \mathbf{h}\left(\left\{\mathcal{O}_\mathbf{V}(3h-H) \to \mathcal{O}_\mathbf{V}(2h-2H)\right\}\right), \tag{3.17}$$

which vanishes by Lemma 3.1. □

4. Derived equivalence by mutation

Recall from [Kuz] that

$$D^b(\mathbf{G}) = \langle \mathcal{O}_\mathbf{G}(-H), \mathscr{U}, \mathcal{O}_\mathbf{G}, \mathscr{U}^\vee, \mathcal{O}_\mathbf{G}(H), \mathscr{U}^\vee(H) \rangle \tag{4.1}$$

and

$$D^b(\mathbf{Q}) = \langle \mathcal{O}_\mathbf{Q}(-3h), \mathcal{O}_\mathbf{Q}(-2h), \mathcal{O}_\mathbf{Q}(-h), \mathscr{S}, \mathcal{O}_\mathbf{Q}, \mathcal{O}_\mathbf{Q}(h) \rangle. \tag{4.2}$$

It follows from [Orl92] that

$$D^b(\mathbf{V}) = \left\langle \iota_* \varpi_+^* D^b(\mathbf{G}), \Phi_+(D^b(\mathbf{V}_+)) \right\rangle \tag{4.3}$$

and

$$D^b(\mathbf{V}) = \left\langle \iota_* \varpi_-^* D^b(\mathbf{Q}), \Phi_-(D^b(\mathbf{V}_-)) \right\rangle, \tag{4.4}$$

where

$$\Phi_+ \coloneqq \phi_+^*(-) \otimes \mathcal{O}_\mathbf{V}(h) \colon D^b(\mathbf{V}_+) \to D^b(\mathbf{V}) \tag{4.5}$$

and

$$\Phi_- \coloneqq \phi_-^*(-) \otimes \mathcal{O}_\mathbf{V}(H) \colon D^b(\mathbf{V}_-) \to D^b(\mathbf{V}). \tag{4.6}$$

(4.1) and (4.3) gives

$$D^b(\mathbf{V}) = \left\langle \mathcal{O}_\mathbf{F}(-H), \mathscr{U}_\mathbf{F}, \mathcal{O}_\mathbf{F}, \mathscr{U}_\mathbf{F}^\vee, \mathcal{O}_\mathbf{F}(H), \mathscr{U}_\mathbf{F}^\vee(H), \Phi_+(D^b(\mathbf{V}_+)) \right\rangle. \tag{4.7}$$

By mutating $\Phi_+(D^b(\mathbf{V}_+))$ two steps to the left, one obtains

$$D^b(\mathbf{V}) = \left\langle \mathcal{O}_\mathbf{F}(-H), \mathscr{U}_\mathbf{F}, \mathcal{O}_\mathbf{F}, \mathscr{U}_\mathbf{F}^\vee, \Phi_1(D^b(\mathbf{V}_+)), \mathcal{O}_\mathbf{F}(H), \mathscr{U}_\mathbf{F}^\vee(H) \right\rangle \tag{4.8}$$

where

$$\Phi_1 \coloneqq Ł_{\left\langle \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(H), \mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}}^{\vee}(H) \right\rangle} \circ \Phi_+. \tag{4.9}$$

By mutating the last two terms to the far left, one obtains

$$D^b(\mathbf{V}) = \left\langle \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(-h), \mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}}^{\vee}(-h), \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(-H), \mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}, \mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}}^{\vee}, \Phi_1(D^b(\mathbf{V}_+)) \right\rangle, \tag{4.10}$$

since $\omega_{\mathbf{V}} \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{V}}(-h-H)$. Lemma 3.3 allows one to move $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(-H)$ to the far left without affecting other objects:

$$D^b(\mathbf{V}) = \left\langle \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(-H), \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(-h), \mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}}^{\vee}(-h), \mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}, \mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}}^{\vee}, \Phi_1(D^b(\mathbf{V}_+)) \right\rangle. \tag{4.11}$$

By mutating $\mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}}$ one step to the left and using Proposition 3.2 and Lemma 3.4, one obtains

$$D^b(\mathbf{V}) = \left\langle \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(-H), \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(-h), \mathscr{S}_{\mathbf{F}}, \mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}}^{\vee}(-h), \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}, \mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}}^{\vee}, \Phi_1(D^b(\mathbf{V}_+)) \right\rangle. \tag{4.12}$$

By mutating $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(-H)$ to the far right, one obtains

$$D^b(\mathbf{V}) = \left\langle \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(-h), \mathscr{S}_{\mathbf{F}}, \mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}}^{\vee}(-h), \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}, \mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}}^{\vee}, \Phi_1(D^b(\mathbf{V}_+)), \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(h) \right\rangle. \tag{4.13}$$

By mutating $\Phi_1(D^b(\mathbf{V}_+))$ to the right, one obtains

$$D^b(\mathbf{V}) = \left\langle \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(-h), \mathscr{S}_{\mathbf{F}}, \mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}}^{\vee}(-h), \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}, \mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}}^{\vee}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(h), \Phi_2(D^b(\mathbf{V}_+)) \right\rangle \tag{4.14}$$

where

$$\Phi_2 \coloneqq \mathbf{R}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(h)} \circ \Phi_1. \tag{4.15}$$

By mutating $\mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}}^{\vee}(-h)$ one step to the right and using Lemma 3.5 and (3.3), one obtains

$$D^b(\mathbf{V}) = \left\langle \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(-h), \mathscr{S}_{\mathbf{F}}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(H-2h), \mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}}^{\vee}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(h), \Phi_2(D^b(\mathbf{V}_+)) \right\rangle. \tag{4.16}$$

Similarly, by mutating $\mathscr{U}_{\mathbf{F}}^{\vee}$ one step to the right, one obtains

$$D^b(\mathbf{V}) = \left\langle \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(-h), \mathscr{S}_{\mathbf{F}}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(H-2h), \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(h), \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(H-h), \Phi_2(D^b(\mathbf{V}_+)) \right\rangle. \tag{4.17}$$

Lemma 3.6 allows one to exchange $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(H-2h)$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(h)$ to obtain

$$D^b(\mathbf{V}) = \left\langle \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(-h), \mathscr{S}_{\mathbf{F}}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(h), \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(H-2h), \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(H-h), \Phi_2(D^b(\mathbf{V}_+)) \right\rangle. \tag{4.18}$$

By mutating $\Phi_2(D^b(\mathbf{V}_+))$ two steps to the left, one obtains

$$D^b(\mathbf{V}) = \left\langle \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(-h), \mathscr{S}_{\mathbf{F}}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(h), \Phi_3(D^b(\mathbf{V}_+)), \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(H-2h), \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(H-h) \right\rangle \tag{4.19}$$

where

$$\Phi_3 \coloneqq Ł_{\langle \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(H-2h), \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(H-h) \rangle} \circ \Phi_2. \tag{4.20}$$

By mutating the last two terms to the far left, one obtains

$$D^b(\mathbf{V}) = \left\langle \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(-3h), \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(-2h), \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(-h), \mathscr{S}_{\mathbf{F}}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(h), \Phi_3(D^b(\mathbf{V}_+)) \right\rangle. \tag{4.21}$$

By comparing (4.21) with

$$D^b(\mathbf{V}) = \left\langle \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(-3h), \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(-2h), \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(-h), \mathscr{S}_{\mathbf{F}}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{F}}(h), \Phi_-(D^b(\mathbf{V}_-)) \right\rangle \tag{4.22}$$

obtained by combining (4.2) and (4.4), one obtains a derived equivalence

$$\Phi \coloneqq \Phi_-^! \circ \Phi_3 \colon D^b(\mathbf{V}_+) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b(\mathbf{V}_-), \tag{4.23}$$

where

$$\Phi_-^!(-) \coloneqq (\phi_-)_* \left((-) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{V}}(-H) \right) : D^b(\mathbf{V}) \to D^b(\mathbf{V}_-) \tag{4.24}$$

is the left adjoint functor of Φ_-. Note that the left mutation along an exceptional object $\mathcal{E} \in D^b(\mathbf{V})$ is an integral functor $\Phi_{\mathcal{K}}(-) \coloneqq (p_2)_* (p_1^*(-) \otimes \mathcal{K})$ along the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \mathbf{V} \times_{\mathbf{V}_0} \mathbf{V} & & \\ & \overset{p_1}{\swarrow} & & \overset{p_2}{\searrow} & \\ \mathbf{V} & & & & \mathbf{V} \end{array} \tag{4.25}$$

whose kernel $\mathcal{K}$ is the cone over the evaluation morphism $\mathrm{ev}\colon \mathcal{E}^\vee \boxtimes \mathcal{E} \to \Delta_{\mathbf{V}}$. The functors $\Phi_+\colon D^b(\mathbf{V}_+) \to D^b(\mathbf{V})$ and $\Phi_-^!\colon D^b(\mathbf{V}) \to D^b(\mathbf{V}_-)$ are clearly an integral functor, so that the functor (4.23) is also an integral functor, whose kernel is an object of $D^b(\mathbf{V}_+ \times_{\mathbf{V}_0} \mathbf{V}_-)$ obtained by convolution.

5. Matrix factorizations

Let s_+ be a general section of the equivariant vector bundle $\mathcal{E}_{(1,1)}$ on $\mathbf{G}$. The zero X_+ of s_+ is a smooth projective Calabi–Yau 3-fold. Since $\mathbf{V}_+$ is the total space of the dual bundle $\mathcal{E}_{(1,1)}^\vee$ on $\mathbf{G}$, the space of regular functions on $\mathbf{V}_+$ which are linear along the fiber can naturally be identified with the space of sections of $\mathcal{E}_{(1,1)}$. We write the regular function on $\mathbf{V}_+$ associated with $s_+ \in H^0\left(\mathcal{E}_{(1,1)}\right)$ as $\varsigma_+ \in H^0\left(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{V}_+}\right)$. The zero D_+ of ς_+ is the union of a line sub-bundle of $\mathbf{V}_+$ and the inverse image of X_+ by the structure morphism $\pi_+\colon \mathbf{V}_+ \to \mathbf{G}$. The singular locus of D_+ is given by X_+.

Let ς_- be a regular function on $\mathbf{V}_-$ corresponding to ς_+ under the isomorphism $H^0\left(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{V}_+}\right) \cong H^0\left(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{V}_0}\right) \cong H^0\left(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{V}_-}\right)$ given by the diagram in (2.16), and X_- be the zero of the corresponding section $s_- \in H^0\left(\mathcal{F}_{(1,1)}\right)$, which is a smooth projective Calabi–Yau 3-fold in $\mathbf{Q}$.

The push-forward of the kernel of Φ on $\mathbf{V}_+ \times_{V_0} \mathbf{V}_-$ to $\mathbf{V}_+ \times_{\mathbb{A}^1} \mathbf{V}_-$ gives a kernel of Φ on $\mathbf{V}_+ \times_{\mathbb{A}^1} \mathbf{V}_-$. By taking the base-change along the inclusion $0 \to \mathbb{A}^1$ of the origin and applying [Kuz06, Proposition 2.44], one obtains an equivalence $\Phi_0\colon D^b(D_+) \cong D^b(D_-)$ of the bounded derived categories of coherent sheaves. By using either of the characterization of perfect complexes as *homologically finite* objects (i.e., objects whose total Ext-groups with any other object are finite-dimensional) or *compact* objects (i.e., objects such that the covariant functors represented by them commute with direct sums), one deduces that Φ_D preserves perfect complexes, so that it induces an equivalence $\Phi_0^{\mathrm{sing}}\colon D^b_{\mathrm{sing}}(D_+) \cong D^b_{\mathrm{sing}}(D_-)$ of singularity categories (see [KKOY09, Section 7] and [BP10, Theorem 1.1]).

Recall that $\mathbf{V}_+$, $\mathbf{V}_-$ and $\mathbf{V}_0$ are geometric invariant theory quotient of $\operatorname{Spec} R$ by the anti-diagonal $\mathbb{G}_m$-action. The residual diagonal $\mathbb{G}_m$-action on both $\mathbf{V}_+$ and $\mathbf{V}_-$ are dilation action on the fiber. The equivalences Φ, Φ_0 and Φ_0^{sing} are equivariant with respect to this $\mathbb{G}_m$-action, and induces an equivalence of $\mathbb{G}_m$-equivariant categories [Hir, Theorem 1.1], which will be denoted by the same symbol by abuse of notation. Now [Isi13, Theorem 3.6] gives equivalences

$$D^b_{\mathrm{sing}}([D_+/\mathbb{G}_m]) \cong D^b(X_+) \tag{5.1}$$

and

$$D^b_{\mathrm{sing}}([D_-/\mathbb{G}_m]) \cong D^b(X_-) \tag{5.2}$$

between $\mathbb{G}_m$-equivariant singularity categories and derived categories of coherent sheaves (see also [Shi12] where the case of line bundles is discussed independently and around the same time as [Isi13]). By composing these derived equivalences with Φ_0^{sing}, one obtains a derived equivalence between X_+ and X_-. It is an interesting problem to compare this

equivalence with the one obtained in [Kuz]. Another interesting problem is to prove the derived equivalence using variation of geometric invariant theory quotient along the lines of [HHP, Seg11, BFK, HL15, ADS15], and use it to produce autoequivalences of the derived category [DS14, HLS16].

References

[ADS15] Nicolas Addington, Will Donovan, and Ed Segal, *The Pfaffian-Grassmannian equivalence revisited*, Algebr. Geom. **2** (2015), no. 3, 332–364. MR 3370126

[BFK] Matthew Ballard, David Favero, and Ludmil Katzarkov, *Variation of geometric invariant theory quotients and derived categories*, arXiv:1203.6643.

[BO02] A. Bondal and D. Orlov, *Derived categories of coherent sheaves*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. II (Beijing, 2002), Higher Ed. Press, Beijing, 2002, pp. 47–56. MR 1957019

[BP10] Vladimir Baranovsky and Jeremy Pecharich, *On equivalences of derived and singular categories*, Cent. Eur. J. Math. **8** (2010), no. 1, 1–14. MR 2593258

[DS14] Will Donovan and Ed Segal, *Window shifts, flop equivalences and Grassmannian twists*, Compos. Math. **150** (2014), no. 6, 942–978. MR 3223878

[HHP] Manfred Herbst, Kentaro Hori, and David Page, *Phases of N=2 theories in 1+1 dimensions with boundary*, arXiv:0803.2045.

[Hir] Yuki Hirano, *Equivalences of derived factorization categories of gauged Landau-Ginzburg models*, arXiv:1506.00177.

[HL15] Daniel Halpern-Leistner, *The derived category of a GIT quotient*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **28** (2015), no. 3, 871–912. MR 3327537

[HLS16] Daniel Halpern-Leistner and Ian Shipman, *Autoequivalences of derived categories via geometric invariant theory*, Adv. Math. **303** (2016), 1264–1299. MR 3552550

[IMOUa] Atsushi Ito, Makoto Miura, Shinnosuke Okawa, and Kazushi Ueda, *Calabi–Yau complete intersections in G_2-grassmannians*, arXiv:1606.04076.

[IMOUb] ———, *The class of the affine line is a zero divisor in the Grothendieck ring: via G_2-Grassmannians*, arXiv:1606.04210.

[IMOUc] ———, *The class of the affine line is a zero divisor in the Grothendieck ring: via K3 surfaces of degree 12*, arXiv:1612.08497.

[Isi13] Mehmet Umut Isik, *Equivalence of the derived category of a variety with a singularity category*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN (2013), no. 12, 2787–2808. MR 3071664

[Kaw02] Yujiro Kawamata, *D-equivalence and K-equivalence*, J. Differential Geom. **61** (2002), no. 1, 147–171. MR MR1949787 (2004m:14025)

[KKOY09] Anton Kapustin, Ludmil Katzarkov, Dmitri Orlov, and Mirroslav Yotov, *Homological mirror symmetry for manifolds of general type*, Cent. Eur. J. Math. **7** (2009), no. 4, 571–605. MR 2563433 (2010j:53184)

[Kuz] Alexander Kuznetsov, *Derived equivalence of Ito–Miura–Okawa–Ueda Calabi–Yau 3-folds*, arXiv:1611.08386.

[Kuz06] A. G. Kuznetsov, *Hyperplane sections and derived categories*, Izv. Ross. Akad. Nauk Ser. Mat. **70** (2006), no. 3, 23–128. MR 2238172 (2007c:14014)

[Orl92] D. O. Orlov, *Projective bundles, monoidal transformations, and derived categories of coherent sheaves*, Izv. Ross. Akad. Nauk Ser. Mat. **56** (1992), no. 4, 852–862. MR MR1208153 (94e:14024)

[Seg11] Ed Segal, *Equivalence between GIT quotients of Landau-Ginzburg B-models*, Comm. Math. Phys. **304** (2011), no. 2, 411–432. MR 2795327

[Seg16] ———, *A new 5-fold flop and derived equivalence*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. **48** (2016), no. 3, 533–538. MR 3509912

[Shi12] Ian Shipman, *A geometric approach to Orlov's theorem*, Compos. Math. **148** (2012), no. 5, 1365–1389. MR 2982435

Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, The University of Tokyo, 3-8-1 Komaba, Meguro-ku, Tokyo, 153-8914, Japan.

E-mail address: kazushi@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp